DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 828 TM 012 789

TITLE Handbook for the New York State Education Department Validation Process: Information, Guidelines, and Forms for New York State Validation of Exemplary Programs.

INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office of Federal Demonstration Programs.

PUB DATE Sep 88

NOTE 44p.

PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Program Validation; *State Programs

IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV C; Exemplary Schools; New York State Education Department

ABSTRACT

The state validation process in New York identifies promising practices developed through the Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV-C funding. The new validation procedures included in this handbook are revised to: (1) make the evaluation process easier to apply; (2) provide technical assistance in evaluating the project; (3) extend eligibility to other state agencies and not-for-profit organizations; (4) be more flexible in the evidence that can be submitted for validation; (5) increase the number of groups examining each application; and (6) provide immediate feedback to each applicant. Topics include: (1) the context of validation; (2) planning the application; (3) preparing the application; (4) application review and response; (5) the technical assistance visit; (6) presentation to the validation panel; and (7) the validation panel. Appendices include the form used by applicants in the validation process, a guide for internal review, forms for the technical assistant, forms for the validation panel members, recommendations of the validation panel members, and an outline of the New York State Education Department's Validation Process. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351020

HANDBOOK FOR THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT VALIDATION PROCESS

Information, Guidelines, and Forms for New York State Validation of Exemplary Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ROBERT M. TROMBLY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of Federal Demonstration Programs
Albany, New York 12234

TM018787

HANDBOOK FOR THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT VALIDATION PROCESS

Information, Guidelines, and Forms for New York State Validation of Exemplary Programs

Revised September 1988

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of Federal Demonstration Programs
Albany, New York 12234

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University

MARTIN C. BARELL, *Chancellor,* B.A., I.A., LL.B. . . . . Muttontown
R. CARLOS CARBALLADA, *Vice Chancellor,* B.S. . . . . Rochester
WILLARD A. GENRICH, LL.B. . . . . Buffalo
EMLYN I. GRIFFITH, A.B., J.D. . . . . Rome
JORGE L. BATISTA, B.A., J.D. . . . . Bronx
LAURA BRADLEY CHODOS, B.A., M.A. . . . . Vischer Ferry
LOUISE P. MATTEONI, B.A., M.A., Ph.D. . . . . Bayside
J. EDWARD MEYER, B.A., LL.B. . . . . Chappaqua
FLOYD S. LINTON, A.B., M.A., M.P.A. . . . . Miller Place
MIMI LEVIN LIEBER, B.A., M.A. . . . . Manhattan
SHIRLEY C. BROWN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D. . . . . Albany
NORMA GLUCK, B.A., M.S.W. . . . . Manhattan
JAMES W. MCCABE, SR., A.B., M.A. . . . . Johnson City
ADELAIDE L. SANFORD, B.A., M.A., P.D. . . . . Hollis
WALTER COOPER, B.A., Ph.D. . . . . Rochester
GERALD J. LUSTIG, B.A., M.D. . . . . Staten Island

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
THOMAS SOBOL

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
THOMAS E. SHELDON

Deputy Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education
LIONEL R. MENO

Assistant Commissioner for ES Educati ianning, Testing and Technological Services
JOHN J. MURPHY

Coordinator, Office of Federal Demonstration Programs
SAMUEL W. CORSI, JR.

The State Education Department does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, religion, creed, disability, marital status, veteran status, national origin, race, or sex in the educational programs and activities which it operates. Inquiries concerning this policy of equal opportunity and affirmative action should be referred to the Department's Affirmative Action Officer, Education Building, Albany, NY 12234. Phone (518) 474-1265.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Context of Validation 1
- The Benefits of Validation 2
- Eligibility 2
- Technical Assistance 3

Planning the Application 4
- Target Groups 4
- Types of Claims of Effectiveness 4
- The Nature of Improvement 5
  - The Claim for Improvement 5
  - Assessment Techniques 6
  - Validity 6
  - Reliability 7
  - Evaluation Design 8
  - Reporting the Data 8

Preparing the Application 9
- Cover Page 9
- Program Description 10
  - Program Objectives or Claims 10
  - Target Groups 10
  - Program Components 10
  - Program Evaluation 10
  - Required Resources 10
  - Additional Documentation 10
  - Related Information 11

Application Review and Response 11

The Technical Assistance Visit 12

Presentation to the Validation Panel 13

Validation Panel 14
- Composition 14
- Governance of the Panel 14
- Location and Scheduling 15
- The Validation Panel Report 15

Reference Notes 16

Resource List 16

APPENDIX A: Forms for the Applicant 17

APPENDIX B: Guide for the Internal Review 21

APPENDIX C: Forms for the Technical Assistant 23

APPENDIX D: Forms for Validation Panel Members 27

APPENDIX E: Recommendations of the Validation Panel 33

APPENDIX F: Outline of the New York State Education Department's Validation Process 37

PREFACE

In the summer of 1976, the concept of State validation was initiated by the State Education Department. The process was called the Quick Validation Process, and was geared toward identifying promising practices which had been developed through ESEA Title IV-C funding. Applications were solicited, and given a preliminary review in the department by the Title IV-C office, a co-administering office, and the Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation. If a site was to be visited, the visit was performed by the member of the co-administering unit. Eighty applications were received during the summer and early autumn of 1976 (three were subsequently withdrawn), and 33 projects were validated. Unfortunately, procedures were not uniformly applied; some projects were validated with weak evidence, while other projects with much stronger evidence were not validated.

Plans for standardizing the process, and for developing a cadre of validation team members external to the Department were being developed late in 1976 and early 1977. Three documents were prepared: *Transferring Successful Practices*, a manual for the validation of educational products and processes, *Validation: A guide for local educational agencies*, and *The Validation Team Handbook*. Between 1979 and 1982, each of the three components of the process was further clarified and standardized, and the *Validation Handbook* was created to inform potential applicants about each phase of the process, and to provide as much guidance as possible for all people involved in the process. One hundred and fifty-one projects were submitted between December 1, 1976, and June 1, 1986. However, only 10 were submitted between June 1, 1983, and January 1, 1987. Of the 151 applications, four were withdrawn, one is still in process, and 75 have been validated. The remaining 71 programs have not been recommended for validation.

Due to the recent decrease in the number of applications submitted for validation, and the lack of submission of traditional or long standing programs, the validation process has been revised again. In August 1986, a panel consisting of Frank Ambrosie, Sam Corsi Jr., Theodore Cromack, Richard Egelston, Michael Pavlovich, Reuben Rusch, and Ronald Szczypkowski was convened to design new validation procedures which would increase the number of programs submitted for validation. The revised process: (1) makes it easier to apply; (2) provides technical assistance in evaluating the program and developing the application; (3) extends the eligibility to other State agencies and to other not-for-profit organizations; (4) is more flexible in the type of evidence which can be submitted for validation; (5) increases the number of relevant groups examining each application; and (6) provides immediate feedback to the applicant. The challenge was to create these new procedures while maintaining a high standard of excellence in projects recommended for validation. The Revised Validation Process is presented in detail on the following pages, and is outlined in Appendix F.

The Context of Validation

Local school districts, Boards of Cooperative Educational Services, State agencies, institutions of higher education, and not-for-profit organizations conducting exemplary educational programs are invited to apply to the State Education Department for Certificates of Validation. These certificates, signed by the Commissioner of Education, are given in recognition of outstanding educational programs and practices which have survived tests of evaluation and validation. Successful programs are recognized by the State Education Department as worthy of dissemination and adoption by others.

Validation is one of a series of quality control procedures employed by the New York State Education Department to identify successful educational programs. Through the identification of successful practices, The State Education Department (SED) can assist school districts and agencies to implement a cost-effective method for producing educational change which has a high probability for success. One study (Egelston, 1981) found that the cost of adopting a successful program averages only 20 percent of the cost of developing a program, and that the full impact of the program can be achieved one year earlier than when a program is locally developed. Another study (Magi Educational Services, 1981) found that when small grants have been provided for start-up costs to adopt a validated program, the programs have a 75 percent chance of continuation in the adopting school after external funding has been discontinued.

The need for Validated programs stems largely from a major weakness in the sharing of ideas and information about programs: the lack of documentation supporting the claims that an educational program works well in a particular situation. Many educators have expressed disappointment upon leaving a school site where an innovative project was presumably operating. Many truly promising practices were lost because potential adopters lost confidence when answers to questions of cost, facilities, staff, pupil growth, and the like were generally unanswered because poor records were kept, or when no systematic data collection design was developed or followed. It is hoped that New York State's Validation program will lessen these frustrations for all who are interested in seeking new ways to solve persistent educational problems.

The dissemination of information concerning educational practices has been a concern of Federal and State governments for a long time. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided an impetus for developing innovative ideas, but little was done to provide for transferring successful practices to other schools. Two outgrowths of the need for identifying successful projects were: (1) the Innovate, Validate, Disseminate (IVD) process by United States Office of Education (USOE), and (2) the formation of the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) by USOE and the National Institute of Education (NIE). JDRP was renamed the Program Effectiveness Panel in 1987. Both processes employed the concept of validation which was intended to provide a quality control mechanism for determining whether a project should be advocated by the Federal or State governments involved. The National Diffusion Network (NDN) was created to disseminate projects validated by JDRP. Over 400 programs have become a part of NDN since 1976.

The New York State Validation process formally starts with the submission of an Appli-

cation for Validation. The Application is reviewed by SED, a technical assistance visit is made to the applicant, and an oral presentation is made by the applicant to a validation panel. However, the process most often is initiated with a telephone call to the Coordinator of Validation to discuss the details of the validation process and the feasibility of preparing an application. Generally, a draft application will be requested, and guidance provided so that the formal application may be submitted with a minimum of anxiety, and a lower likelihood of critical response. Persons who are interested should call the Coordinator of Validation at (518) 474-2380.

The Benefits of Validation

Validation offers an opportunity to have a peer review of an educational program. If the program is validated, the State Education Department will recognize the program, and become an advocate for it. The program will be summarized in *Educational Programs That Work In New York State*, and other districts will be encouraged to adopt it, providing these districts have needs which can be addressed by the program.

A Certificate of Validation will be issued to the Board of Education in the name of the program, a letter of congratulations will be provided to the school superintendent, and staff members who will be trainers will be awarded Training Certificates for the program. The letter of congratulations, and the certificates will be presented to the Board of Education, the superintendent, and the staff trainers by a State Education Department representative at a local Board of Education meeting, if requested. School districts have reported very favorable public relations results after a program has been validated. Individuals who are closely associated with a validated program have reported that personal and professional recognition on the part of their peers has been very rewarding. These people are often seen as leaders in their field, and other opportunities sometimes become available to them. Project directors are often asked by the SED to make presentations at statewide and regional meetings.

Newly validated programs are eligible to receive small grants (as long as funds are available) for disseminating their program to other school districts. Brochures and training materials may be prepared with the money, and awareness presentations at professional conferences may also be supported with the grant. Grants are also available to other districts for the purpose of adopting the program. These applicants are asked to include funds in their budgets to pay honoraria for training, for travel expenses, and for curricular and evaluation materials which must be purchased from the district which developed the program.

Eligibility

Any public school district, Board of Cooperative Educational Services, nonpublic school, campus school, institution of higher education, State agency, foundation, and not-for-profit organization within New York State may submit an Application for Validation for any educational program which will serve educational needs of children or adults. Programs which are submitted from profit- making agencies will not be accepted; however, a school district (or other not-for-profit agency) may submit a commercially developed program. Programs which have been developed outside of New York State may be submitted for validation by a New York State agency. All programs receiving validation must have a demonstration site and certified trainers located within New York State. Only applicant agencies will be awarded Certificates of Validation. Programs developed outside of New York State which have received validation by JDRP or the Program Effectiveness Panel should not apply for New York State validation even though trainers

and a demonstration site are available within New York State, except under special circumstances.

Under special circumstances, a joint Application by two or more agencies may be submitted, but advanced permission *must* be secured from the Coordinator of Validation at The State Education Department, Room 860, The State Education Department, Albany, NY 12234. The telephone number is (518) 474-2380.

Programs must meet several criteria before The State Education Department will consider them for validation. Each program must:

1. Contain a curriculum for children or adults;
2. Require staff training to deliver the curriculum;
3. Have an evaluation process which can be replicated;
4. Relate to needs of children or adults at other locations;
5. Be cost effective, and transferable.

Applicants who are successful in securing validation for their program must assure the State Education Department that they will be willing to provide the staff training necessary to deliver and evaluate the program at another school district or agency, under the condition that all of the training and evaluation costs for this service will be reimbursed by that district. Any equipment or materials developed by the applicant must be made available to replicators on a cost reimbursable basis. (Demonstrators are not allowed to make a profit on equipment and materials necessary to replicate the program, although they are allowed to charge replicators for travel expenses and reasonable consulting fees for the time they provide.)

The source of funding which was used to develop the program is irrelevant. The program could have been developed using tax levy funds, State grants, Federal grants, grants from foundations or profit-making organizations or any combination thereof.

Technical Assistance

The State Education Department will provide as much assistance as possible to help applicants prepare for validation at each stage of the process. Applicants who are considering submission of their program for validation may be eligible to receive evaluation assistance from the Coordinator of Validation. If the program is one which addresses statewide priorities, as determined by the Board of Regents, and if funds are available, the Coordinator of Validation will arrange for evaluation expertise to assist project staff to plan evaluation strategies, conduct data analyses, and assist with the development of the application for validation. Draft applications will be informally reviewed, and suggestions offered to the author concerning the program description and presentation of the evidence.

A Technical Assistant who has evaluation expertise will visit the program to help assess the readiness of the program staff to pursue validation. This assistant will be available for one day at no cost to the applicant, and the Coordinator of Validation at SED will be responsible for arranging for the visit. This person may, at the request of the applicant, become the program evaluator, prepare a part of the application, and present the evidence to the validation panel.

It is recommended that District Superintendents use a Cooperative Service Agreement (COSER), either individually or in a consortium, to support the provision of evaluation services. While the availability of shared evaluation services will not insure the use of the

service for validation by school districts, it would represent an option, and might serve to encourage more widespread program evaluation apart from validation.

The Coordinator of Validation will also assist the applicant prepare the presentation to the validation panel. Suggestions concerning the topics to present, the type of staff to make the presentation, and the materials to use during the presentation will be advanced. In addition, the Coordinator will also arrange to have the presenters meet the panelists (perhaps over lunch) prior to the presentation. If the panel members recommend any changes in the application, the Coordinator will help the applicant make those changes.

Planning the Application

Before writing the first draft of the application, it is important to carefully consider each of the topics in this section, and to outline the main points. Since teachers, or other staff members, may have been involved in certain evaluation activities before the project has ended, it may also be possible to include some parts of the sections concerned with reliability and validity. Outlining the data analysis techniques and interpreting the results may be left until the technical assistance visit has been accomplished, unless the data analyses have been completed prior to the technical assistance visit.

Target Groups

Any group of people may be identified as a target group, irrespective of age, background, or learning characteristics, and may be in any setting from tutorial to mass audience. Target group members may all have the same task to learn (e.g. mathematics achievement), or may have differing tasks to learn (e.g. individualized educational programs). Target groups should be identified in a manner which allows for the best instructional description (e.g. by separate grade levels, rather than by school building). The key to the description of the target group is the primary evaluation instrument. If the instructional program and evaluation instruments are identical for everyone, and if the reference groups (i.e. norms) for interpreting the scores of individuals are the same, then those members who were given the instrument would logically form a target group. It is not necessary to be consistent in the description of the target group from one objective or claim of effectiveness to another. For example, it is appropriate to describe grades 4, 5, and 6 as three target groups for the cognitive aspects of a drug education program if different achievement tests are used, but as a single target group for attitude changes if the same attitude instrument is used for all grades.

Types of Claims of Effectiveness

The following types of claims for program effectiveness are an attempt to indicate the flexibility in the validation process, and *not* an attempt to limit the types of claims submitted to only those listed below. The list is suggestive, not exhaustive. When the focus is on the learner, it is appropriate to measure:

1. Changes in knowledge
2. Changes in attitudes

3. Changes in psychomotor skills
4. Changes in the way time is spent.

When the focus is on the institution (e.g. changing the procedures in which management or staff do their work), it is appropriate to measure:

5. Changes in the effectiveness of delivering services (e.g. long-range planning may result in more data being considered for any given decision, may increase the number of relevant people in the decision-making process, or may reduce the number of decisions being later changed);
6. Changes in the efficiency of delivering services (e.g. long-range planning may result in reaching more clients at the same cost, or the same number at a lower cost, or may free people up to do more things while keeping the cost the same and serving the same number of clients).

Claims of effectiveness should be very carefully thought out when more than one claim is being considered for validation. The applicant should clearly identify those claims which are of primary importance for the program, and make only those. Applicants should consider how some people may represent the program to others after adopting it. Since a program may be adopted for any claim, without reference to other claims, the applicant should retain as much control over the program as possible. For example, if the program produces both changes in achievement and attitude, the applicant may wish to limit the claim to achievement, although presenting the data for attitude as one of the causes of increased achievement. To make claims for both achievement and attitude changes would allow an adoption of the program for attitude change only, without paying any attention to the achievement changes. In general programs which claim to make improvements in learning should be limited to a single claim of effectiveness. Data from variables relating to learning should be presented as supporting data for the claim of learning, rather than as a claim by itself.

The evidence for effectiveness may be created from norm referenced procedures or from criterion referenced procedures. Comparisons can be made using either type of procedure, and independent standards may be set for each claim of effectiveness made.

The Nature Of Improvement

The following guidelines are intended to indicate what is minimally necessary to have available, and to present to the Validation Panel.

A. The Claim for Improvement

Claims of effectiveness may be stated as program objectives, or as program conclusions. The statements should include information relative to the target group, the nature of the change, the size of the change, how the change was determined, and how long it took to produce the change. The size of the improvement may be stated as a gain (indicating a comparison with one or more groups), or it may be stated as a level of performance which is higher than expected, providing the level of expectation can be supported by data of a type different from the performance data.

The target group for most programs will be students who will be given tests, or attitude scales, etc. However, many programs have activities which involve teachers, administrators, or parents as a necessary part of the program, and it will often be advisable to collect evaluation information from these groups concerning the stu-

dents. Impressions of both teachers and parents about changes in attitude toward learners often bolster direct measures of attitude change. Questionnaires and interviews about "'outside" activities of learners may elicit quantifiable data in support of claims for program effectiveness.

Another example of important data for program evaluation may come from staff development activities. If teachers need to be trained in certain classroom techniques (e.g. Essential Elements of Instruction), then it is important to get evaluation evidence that teachers have understood, and can demonstrate the concepts which are later going to be used in the classroom. If teachers have been observed performing the skills successfully in practice situations, then it is easy to believe that changes in achievement of children may be due to changes in teacher behavior within the classroom.

Several sets of data may convince the Validation Panel that meaningful gains can be attributed to the program, even if none of then can show statistical significance at the .05 level. The concept of convergent validity is important to validation: several sources of data which have been collected from the treatment group, or related groups (e. g. parents, teachers etc.) may provide a more convincing argument than a single source of data. Similarly, data from several variables related to gains in learning (e.g. time on task, self-concept, attendance) are more convincing than data only showing increased learning, and may explain gains in learning.

B. Assessment Techniques

The applicant should be prepared to answer questions concerning the methods of data collection for each method used in support of a claim for improvement. Such questions may relate to the timing of the data collection (e.g. Were the tests administered during the standardization window?), to the conditions under which data were collected (e.g. Did each student have the same amount of time for each test?), to the scoring of the tests (e.g. Were all answer sheets scored by the same person?), to the type of score being reported (e.g. What were the rules for classifying an observation into this category?), or to the identification of variables being assessed (How was long-range planning defined?). These considerations will assist the panel to determine whether the interpretation of data was consistent with accepted evaluation practice.

Criterion referenced approaches are acceptable when norm referenced approaches are not reasonable. Criterion referenced approaches are generally used when members of the target population do not all have identical outcomes to assess (e.g. programs where students have to perform or present a project before an audience, or to demonstrate achievement of individualized objectives). In these cases, trained judges are needed, and all criteria for making judgments must be described.

Case study designs may be acceptable when the program is complex, and the focus is upon procedures rather than outcomes. Outcome data are important, but the outcomes may be different when the procedures are used in several contexts. Programs which have a goal of changing the manner in which an organization operates (e.g. long-range planning) are logical candidates for case studies. Other ethnographic techniques may also be used in evaluating this type of program.

C. Validity

The applicant must make an attempt to establish that data used in the evaluation process represented a reasonable measurement of the program being described. This

should be done by asking the people who deliver the program (e.g. teachers) to agree that techniques of data collection, timing of data collection, and conditions under which the data were collected represent a fair assessment of the program for the claim submitted. For example, when achievement or other tests are given to the target population, it is necessary to have agreement that the test items represent the full extent of content for the program, and that scoring procedures are reasonable. In cases when ratings of the quality of products form the data in support of a claim, then an agreement is necessary among teachers which indicates that the criteria used in assigning the ratings fairly represent the range of curricula in the program. In cases where observational checklists or coding schemes for behavioral observations are used, then agreement among teachers is necessary that the categories, fairly represent the program.

Commercially available tests will generally be valid, particularly if teachers have had some say in the selection of the tests. However, the test must be used with the type of population specified in the manual. If out-of-level testing is used, then agreement among teachers must be reached that the test items are appropriate. Great care must be made when interpreting any score derived from out-of-level testing. Scores provided in tables of norms (e.g. grade equivalents, normal curve equivalents, percentile ranks, etc.) are valid only for those populations described in the test manuals.

In naturalistic inquiry (ethnographic studies), the term which is used to represent validity is "'fittingness." In using this methodology (e.g. in case studies), variables may be identified and coding schemes developed as the inquiry proceeds, and it is necessary to show that variables are relevant and the data sources appropriate, credible, and fitting to the program objectives. Validity of content should be obvious in the findings.

D. Reliability

Consistency among the data elements is very important, and there are many ways for determining whether data are consistent. While no level of reliability may be set as a minimally acceptable level, a high level of reliability will more favorably impress the Panel than a low level of reliability.

Commercially available achievement tests generally possess an adequate level of reliability, but it will be necessary to assess their reliability if out-of-level testing is done. Locally developed tests cannot be assumed to possess reliability, and some data must be collected and analyzed to establish reliability, and should be determined from groups not receiving the treatment.

Simple descriptive procedures may be used for multiple choice tests (e.g. split-half, KR-20, or Chronbach's alpha). Test-retest methods may be used in some situations. In the case of scoring or rating projects (e.g. narrative exercises, computer programs, art work etc.), it is important for two or more people to independently score the projects using the same criteria, and to correlate the scores assigned. In the case of observations of behavior, it is important to have two or more people code the behavior, and to determine the percent of agreement among the coded observations.

Reliability of less traditional data gathering methods such as naturalistic inquiry or ethnographic studies are more difficult to define. These methodologies depend upon a detailed description of all procedures of data collection and classification for determining reliability. Adopting procedures used in published studies may be appropriate, even if the context is different. It is necessary to establish that a second person with similar training would arrive at the same conclusions given the same data. This may best be demonstrated by having the second person code the raw data using the

same procedures, and then drawing the same conclusions from the data. The results of the overall data gathering are more appropriately examined for consistency of method than for consistency of measuring instruments.

E. Evaluation Design

Comparisons are made based upon experimental designs, and are performed to determine if program effects are greater than would have occurred by chance if the particular program had not been in existence. It is *not* necessary to rule out all competing hypotheses to conclude that the program *probably* caused the outcome. Evaluation designs which employ random assignment to treatment are not necessary, although they would provide a compelling argument. Comparisons are often made to predecessor programs, current nontreatment programs, or to programs with similar outcomes in other locations (e.g. state or national norms). When a new program is initiated (e.g. for gifted students) where no program existed previously, it may be acceptable to measure progress against a no program outcome (usually zero). However, in these latter cases it is necessary to establish baseline data at the start of the program.

The strongest comparisons use groups composed of randomly assigned students, and the weakest comparisons are those which use only pretest and posttest measures on the treatment group. Comparisons with state or national norms fall in the middle. The use of available groups will be the rule, not the exception, and any nontreatment groups used should be as similar to the treatment groups as possible on learning characteristics, socioeconomic status, and biographical variables, since differences in these variables may be more influential in determining outcomes than the influence of the treatment.

An evaluation specialist can help in constructing designs and performing statistical comparisons. The Technical Assistant assigned to visit the program will have these skills, and will have the function of providing recommendations concerning comparisons which have been completed, and those which could be completed with existing data. This person will also indicate whether the evidence which has been collected is likely to convince the validation panel of the program's success, or if data on other variables would be beneficial to collect and analyze.

F. Reporting the data

Most data will be reported in tabular form, and display summaries of the results (e.g. means and standard deviations, or percent completing minimum requirements). It is important to clearly show how much improvement has taken place. This improvement is most easily demonstrated by providing a comparison of treatment groups with control groups, or posttests with pretests. In the case where several data sources each contribute to the conclusion that improvement has taken place, the sources should be presented together. If statistical analyses have been performed upon the data (and statistical comparisons are often very believable), then names of the analyses should be included, along with important features of the analyses (e.g. analysis of variance tables). In many instances tables are self-explanatory. However, most of the time it is helpful to have a short written narrative indicating what the reader should look for in the tables along with an explanation of the type of data which has been analyzed. Graphics are also good ways to supplement tables if trends are important to establish, or if interactions among variables are significant. In the cases of student projects, samples should be included.

The relative worth of an improvement requires a subjective judgment, and pro-

grams must show gains which are educationally significant. No standards have been set in advance for how much improvement is necessary to convince the panel that the program is successful. The panel will have to be convinced that the amount of gain is worthy of making a financial investment in the program. Statistical gains should be at least at the .05 level of significance if only a single set of data is used to report evidence of success. The applicant should also keep in mind that statistically significant gains which are small may not be *educationally* significant. The panel may conclude that a small gain would not merit the financial investment to replicate the program at another location.

Preparing the Application

The Applicant is strongly encouraged to use the application forms provided in Appendix A, although it may be possible to use documents developed for other purposes to report the program description or evaluation evidence. Any applicant desiring details about the use of alternative documents should contact the Coordinator of Validation, Office of Federal Demonstration Programs, 860 EBA, The State Education Department, Albany, NY 12234, or telephone (518) 474-1280. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to submit one copy of a preliminary draft of the application to receive feedback more quickly. The draft application does not need to contain the Superintendent's signature.

Four copies of an application (see Appendix A) each consisting of a cover page, a short narrative description of the program and either the Data Collection Report in Appendix A, or the evaluation results are initially required. Locally-developed *curricular documents and evaluation instruments* should be appended to the application. After the technical assistance visit has been completed, 10 copies of the revised application are needed. Send all copies to the address provided in the paragraph above.

The purpose of the program description is to provide the reader with a concise understanding of the program to be reviewed. Clarity and brevity should guide the writer in communicating the program's parameters. If the program being submitted for validation has been funded by a grant, then sections of the grant application may be submitted as the narrative. If the program has been written up in a final report to a funding agency, or for publication, then these documents may be substituted for the program description and the Data Collection Report. Clarification of these substitutions in advance should be secured from the Coordinator of Validation.

The application with appendices, technical assistance report, and validation panel report are public documents, and as such may by provided to anyone upon request. Copies of the application may be used as examples to help other applicants prepare for validation, and applicants may request copies of applications submitted by other applicants. However, application and review materials will not be distributed until the validation panel has made a recommendation for validation.

The Cover Page

Include the program title; name and address of applicant agency; name, address, and telephone number of contact person. Formal submission of the application must contain the signature of the Chief Administrative Officer who assures cooperation with the State Education Department.

Program Description

(include the following topics):

A. Program Objectives or Claims.

Specify the variables which have been measured in the target groups, *and* for which data will be submitted. Pages 5-6 of this document identify how to prepare claims and objectives.

B. Target Groups

Identify the program's *target groups* by any relevant characteristics (e.g. grade levels, ages, learning characteristics). A target group consists of people who are the focus of project activities and evaluation.

C. Program Components

Describe the *major components* of the program including new curricula, essential teaching strategies (e.g use of aides), learner activities (e.g. field trips), and any other relevant activity or event. Describing any uniqueness about the program would be helpful to the readers. Indicate how long the program has been in operation, and the intensity of the treatment during the day, or week (e.g. infusion into two or more content areas, or once every other day), and the duration in weeks, months or years of the treatment for each component. Be sure to include an indication of how staff were trained, and how they implement the program.

D. Program Evaluation

Applicants *may* submit evaluation evidence with the application, but it is *not* required. It is necessary for data to have been collected before preparing the application in order to make preliminary judgments about the size of gains, and which may be seen and verified during a visit. In the event that the data have not been analyzed, the applicant should complete and submit the Data Collection Report (see Appendix A). However, if data have already been analyzed, then the Data Collection Report should be omitted, and the write-up of the results included in the application. Assessment procedures, indications of reliability and validity, evaluation design, and results sections should be prepared (see pages 6-9 for additional explanation). Present the analyses in tabular or graphical form along with a narrative statement interpreting the analyses.

E. Required Resources

Describe the training and *major resources* needed to replicate the program. Include the number of staff, and the number of days of training and follow-up monitoring which would be desirable for program adoption. An indication of special facilities, and a list of important materials and items of equipment necessary for program adoption should be included. An attempt should be made to portray the costs an adopting district would incur if the program were going to be installed in a single average sized building.

F. Additional Documentation

One copy of all *instructional and support documents* locally developed should be appended to each application (curriculum guides content descriptions, instructional activities) along with one copy of locally developed evaluation instruments (tests, questionnaires, answer keys, scoring guides, checklists, etc.), and training materials.

G. Related Information

References to *relevant research findings from the literature,* and/or theoretical underpinnings are desirable, but not required.

Letters of support from professionals and experts who are independent from the program, and letters from professional associations are also desirable but not required. It is expected that these documents would reveal an understanding of the conceptual framework and the details of the program by the author, and would provide additional support for the quality **and** statewide need for the program. If these individuals or groups are supporting the claims for improvement, then the size of the gains should be compared with typical gains made by programs of this type when used with these target groups. Letters of support which do not provide new information to the readers of the application will not increase the likelihood of securing validation.

Application Review and Response

The application is reviewed in a collegial but critical manner, and is designed to provide feedback which will help the applicant communicate with the validation panel more effectively. Copies of each review will be provided to the district, Technical Assistant and the Validation Panel. Amending the application by substituting pages, sending in supplements, or by submitting a whole new application is optional. Copies of the application will be reviewed by the Office of Federal Demonstration Programs as well as each unit within the State Education Department having responsibilities for the program content area. The following topics are appropriate:

1. Clarity of program objectives or claims, program description, target group description, evaluation, and adoption requirements;
2. Relation to statewide needs and Agency priorities;
3. Relevant conceptual basis or philosophical orientation;
4. Compliance with Commissioner's Regulations;
5. Thoroughness of the curricular documents, and relation to existing State curricula and syllabi;
6. Coherence of the main components and/or activities of the program;
7. Management aspects and instructional strategies used in the program;
8. Adequacy of evaluation instruments, data collection procedures, extent of data available for evaluation, and comparisons planned or completed;
9. Training requirements and resources needed for program adoption.
10. Availability of programs of this type for these target groups, which have been validated by NDN and the State and which are still available for adoption.

The Technical Assistance Visit

After the applicant has responded to the reviews by SED, a technical assistant who is an evaluation specialist will visit the program to help assess the readiness of the program staff to pursue validation. This person will be available for one day at no cost to the applicant, and the Coordinator of Validation at SED will be responsible for arranging the visit. Each technical assistant is familiar with the validation process and Sharing Successful Programs and is able to help:

1. Clarify the program objectives or claims if necessary.
2. Determine whether the evidence for each source and type of data indicated in the application exists in sufficient quantity and has acceptable validity and reliability to justify continuing to pursue validation, or whether the applicant is willing and able to collect additional data in those cases where existing data may not be strong enough for validation.
3. Determine whether appropriate analyses of data have been, or can be, performed.
4. Identify elements of the program which may be transferable.
5. Organize the evaluation evidence for both written and oral presentation;
6. Identify curricular documents, evaluation instruments, and staff training materials which should be provided to the Panel;
7. Identify costs of replication on a unit basis;
8. Make recommendations concerning other areas needing strengthening in the application;
9. Estimate the extent of evaluation service needed, and provide names of some evaluation specialists who might be available to perform this service. The evaluation specialist may make arrangements to continue working with the applicant, but must create his/her own financial arrangements with the applicant.

The evaluation specialist will submit a written report to the applicant indicating recommendations concerning the topics above. Copies of the report will be sent to SED, and may be made available to validation panel members in preparation for the presentation. The recommendations are principally for the applicant and do not necessarily reflect SED policy. If additional assistance in carrying out the recommendations is needed, then the applicant will be responsible for generating the necessary resources. The individual who makes the recommendations is not under any restriction, or obligation, to perform additional work with the applicant.

In order to efficiently use the service provided by the evaluation specialist, it will be necessary to have information organized in advance of the visit. Copies of all curricular documents, staff development materials, evaluation instruments, data summaries and statistical analyses (if any) should be available in a central location. In addition, the technical assistant will want to talk with the project coordinator, and some staff members who might become involved in providing assistance to adopters. Any consultants used for curriculum development or evaluation should be alerted to the possibility of telephone conversations with the technical assistant if they are unable to meet at the agencies' site.

Upon arrival, the technical assistant will describe Sharing Success Programs, and indicate how validation is a quality control mechanism designed to assure a potential adopter that the project has worked under a particular set of circumstance with a certain target group.

After the visit by the technical assistant, the applicant may submit any revisions to the application, including results and narrative explanation to the Coordinator of Validation. If the data appear to be strong enough for validation panel consideration, then all materials will be forwarded to the panel. If the data do not appear strong enough to support validation, then the Coordinator of Validation will inform the applicant in writing, and make suggestions concerning how to improve it. *If the applicant still wants to go before the Panel without making changes, then all documents will be forwarded to the Panel as requested.*

Presentation to the Validation Panel

Since validation panel members will have carefully read all materials in advance of the presentation, and will have discussed the application among themselves prior to the presentation, the applicant should carefully plan the presentation to supplement the application and curricular documents. Some overlap will be necessary, and it is recommended that management, instructional components, and additional evidence be emphasized. The question and answer period will allow for clarification by the panel. It is also suggested that no more than four people contribute to the presentation (e.g. the project coordinator, a building principal, a teacher, and the program evaluator).

The oral presentation should be planned for between 45 and 90 minutes, to be followed by a 15 to 20-minute question and answer session. It is difficult to generalize about how to organize the presentation, but topics listed below should be considered. Presenters must decide what is important for the listener to know. Audio-visual aids may be employed to aid in describing the program, but arrangements in advance will need to be made.

1. Program development:
   Description of community;
   Description of agency;
   Initial need for program;
   History of development;
   Theoretical framework.

2. Program activities:
   Scope of program;
   Instructional activities of teachers;
   Learning activities of students;
   Integration of program into existing curricula;
   Unique aspects of the program.

3. Evaluation methods and results:
   How were data collected;
   Under what conditions were data collected;
   Who collected data, and who organized it for analysis;
   When were data collected;
   What are the differences in characteristics between target groups and comparison groups (if any).

4. Transferability:
   How staff will be trained;
   What the recommended training procedures will be (including duration and sequencing of training sessions);
   What resources will be needed for training;
   What are the costs of trainers, including follow-up monitoring.

The Coordinator of Validation will make all necessary arrangements for the presentation and will serve as a liaison between the applicant and the panel, and should be contacted for assistance in planning the presentation.

The Validation Panel

The purpose of the validation panel is to make a recommendation to the Commissioner of Education whether or not to validate an educational program. The panel is provided with written materials, and an oral presentation. If the panel is convinced the program has evidence to demonstrate that its objectives have been achieved, and there is a probable need for the program in other school of New York State, then the panel should recommend validation for the program.

Composition

The Panel will be composed of one member to represent each of the following groups:

1. School (or agency) administrators;
2. Curriculum development or instructional design specialists;
3. Content (or service delivery) specialists;
4. Evaluation specialists;
5. Boards of Education (or advisory boards);
6. Parents (or community members);
7. A teachers' union.

Governance of the Panel

The Coordinator of Validation serves as liaison to the validation panel, but is not a member of the panel. Only people invited by the applicant will be allowed to make the presentation. A chairperson will be appointed from the panel who will direct the discussion prior to the presentation, the question and answer session, the subsequent discussion period, announce the recommendation to the presenters, and prepare the Validation Panel Report.

Validation panel members will be given all appropriate documents in advance of the meeting, and be provided with an orientation session before reviewing a program. The orientation session will be followed by a discussion period in which the panel discusses the strong and weak points of the program and organizes the question and answer period. The panel must also sort out those questions for which it is necessary to secure

answers from those in which it would be nice to know answers, since time will be limited. The Coordinator of Validation will not be present during this discussion.

Visitors may be present during the presentation and question period. However, they will not be allowed to ask questions of the presenters during the time reserved for the panel. They may ask questions during the deliberations of the panel, when all visitors and presenters will have left the room. Furthermore, after the presentation has started (e.g. during breaks) there will not be any interaction between visitors and panel members concerning the program.

During deliberations, the panel should: Determine if the program has value to similar agencies, determine if the evidence is appropriate and convincing that improvement has been achieved, determine if the program was the primary cause of the improvement, and decide which of the following recommendations to make:

1. Recommend validation for whole program, or a portion of the program (e.g. for some target groups, or for some objectives or claims). Five votes of the seven-member Panel will be needed for a recommendation to validate the program.
2. Delay recommending validation until some condition has been fulfilled, and may designate SED to judge if the condition has been fulfilled.
3. Recommend the program not be validated until new evidence has been collected.

A guide for taking notes prior to and during the presentation (see Appendix D) may also to be used to identify follow-up questions, strong and weak points in the program, and unique aspects of the program. These notes may also be needed for the subsequent discussion. The notes should *not* be submitted with the Validation Panel Report.

Location and Scheduling

A validation panel will be convened in Albany whenever an applicant is ready to make the presentation. Each panel will review only one program. The following schedule is typical:

9:30-10:00 Arrival and introductions (over coffee & danish)
10:00-10:30 Orientation to Sharing Successful Programs
10:30-11:45 Panel discussion of application
11:45- 1:00 Lunch with presenters
1:00- 2:30 Presentation by applicant
2:30- 3:00 Question and answer period
3:00- 3:30 Panel deliberations, and announcement
3:30- 4:00 Informal discussion and departure

The Validation Panel Report

The Chairperson will file a report (see Appendix E) with SED indicating the recommendation of the Validation Panel, and what the Panel feels to be the important elements of the program, including content, instructional strategies, evaluation evidence, costs of replication, and other recommendations of the Panel.

Reference Notes

Egelston, Richard L. Transferring educational success: Is the ESEA Title IV-C model more cost effective than the Title III model in New York State. Presented at the annual meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization, Lenox, MA, April 1981.

Magi Educational Services. January 1981 update on New York State Replicator Study. (Preliminary report to the State Education Department.) Larchmont, NY: Author, January 1981.

Resource List

Cordray, David S. and Lipsey, Mark W. (Eds.) *Evaluation Studies* Review Annual 11. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1987.

Eisner, Elliot (Ed.) *Learning and Teaching the Ways of Knowing*. The 84th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Fetterman, David M. (Ed.) *Ethnography in Educational Evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. 1984.

Greene, Jennifer & McClintock W. "Triangulation in Evaluation." *Evaluation Review*, 1985,9 (5), 523-545.

Guba, Egon G. & Lincoln, Yvonne S. *Effective Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Weilemmann, Alexander. *Evaluation Research and Social Change*. Ghent, Belgium: UNESCO, 1980. See Chapter 2 (pp.23-35) "A Critical Review of Evaluation Research Literature."

APPENDIX A

Forms for the Applicant

(See Handbook pages 9-11 for directions.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COVER PAGE

Revised September 1988

File # RV – _____

Application for Validation

Title of Program: _____

_____

_____

Name of Applicant Agency and Address: _____

_____

_____

Name and Address of Contact Person: _____

_____

Telephone of Contact Person: (_____) _____ Ext. _____

This application is a public document, and may be provided to other people.

Assurances of Cooperation:

I will provide access for a technical assistant to visit the program to examine curricular documents, evaluation instruments, data and statistical analyses, and opportunities to converse with staff for one day, following submission of the application. (The applicant will not assume any cost of this visit.)

If this program is validated, I will allow the program to be visited by interested parties, and I will make staff available for up to 10 days per year for three years to conduct awareness sessions, staff training, and follow-up technical assistance upon request, providing all costs are reimbursed to this agency. I also assure that any materials developed by this agency for the program will be made available to any replicator of the program for a cost not to exceed the costs of duplication of the materials.

_____ _____

(Signature of Chief Administrator of Agency) (Date)

_____

(Typed name of Chief Administrator of Agency)

Program Description

Provide a short narrative describing the program for which validation is sought. Refer to pages 10-11 of the Handbook for directions. Please note that it is not necessary to provide extensive detail; a more detailed description should be planned for the oral presentation to the Validation Panel. Include program objectives or claims, target group descriptions, a description of major components, and adoption information. If evaluation results have been determined, then include them. Copies of curricular documents and locally developed evaluation instruments should be appended.

Data Collection Report[1]

1 Names of Data Collection Instruments	2 Group Involved	3 When Collected	4 Amount of Improvement	5 Comparisons Performed
Achievement Tests				
Attitude Scales				
Product Ratings				
Observational Checklists				
Questionnaires				
Behavioral Records				
Other Forms Of Evidence				

[1]In column 1, write the name of each instrument used for data collection.
In column 2, write the name of the group (students, parents, teachers, etc.) from which data were collected.
In column 3, write B, M, T, E for the relative times data were collected:
- B = Before, or at the beginning of the program;
- M = Near the middle of the program;
- T = At several points throughout the program;
- E = At, or after the end of the program.

In column 4, write S, M, or L for small, medium, and large estimated improvement:
- S = a small amount (e. g. not close to the .05 level of statistical significance);
- M = a moderate amount (e. g. close to the .05 level of statistical significance);
- L = a large amount (e. g. at or exceeding the .05 level of statistical significance).

In column 5, write numbers 1-7 for the type of comparison performed (if any):
- 1 = Comparison with selves (prepost);
- 2 = Comparison with a national or state reference group;
- 3 = Comparison with a nontreatment local group in the applicant agency;
- 4 = Comparison with a nontreatment group at another agency;
- 5 = Comparison with an expected result derived from related studies;
- 6 = No comparison (e. g. casestudy methodology);
- 7 = Other; please describe.

APPENDIX B

Guide For the Internal Review

(See Handbook page 11 for directions.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SED Review Of Application For Validation

Revised September 1988.

File # RV – _____

Name of Unit: _____

Name of Reviewer: _____

Title of Program: _____

Applicant Agency: _____

Date of Review: _____

Directions:

The revised validation process includes a review of all curricular and staff development documents, locally developed evaluation instruments, and evaluation procedures which have been used by the applicant in the program submitted for validation. The applicant has been requested to provide a brief description of the program, and append all relevant documents. The objectives or claims, target groups, program components, and adoption requirements should be described in the application. Data for determining the effectiveness of the program should have been collected by the applicant, but may not be analyzed. The Data Collection Report, or the evaluation narrative, will indicate what data are available, and how much improvement each source of data contribute to the evaluation. While analyses do not have to be completed at the time of application, they must be completed before the program is submitted to a Validation Panel.

Please review the application and attachments concerning the clarity and completeness of description for the topics listed below. Salient features of the intervention and evaluation should be provided in the application, without exhaustive detail. Feel free to comment on anything the applicant or the Validation Panel should know when it considers this program for validation. Use a separate page, but attach this cover page.

Objectives or claims of the program;
Target group(s) of learners;
Conceptual framework of the program and curricular documents;
Management and instructional strategies;
Consistency among program components;
Relation to statewide needs and Content Bureau priorities;
Relation to State syllabi;
Compliance with Commissioner's Regulations;
Data collection procedures and evaluation instruments;
Evaluation design;
Anticipated or actual results;
Adoption requirements;
Availability of competing programs.

Copies of the completed review will be sent to the applicant, the Technical Assistant, and members of the Validation Panel. Please return all documents and the completed review to the Coordinator of Validation, 860 EBA, The State Education Department, Albany, N.Y. 12234.

APPENDIX C

Forms for the Technical Assistant

(See Handbook pages 12-13 for directions.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Technical Assistance Report

Revised September 1988 File # RV – _____

Your Name: _____

Name of Agency Visited: _____

_____

Title of Program: _____

Date of Visit: _____

People Interviewed: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Directions:

Review the application for validation and directions provided to the applicant for preparing the application (see Handbook pages 9-11), before calling the contact person to schedule your visit. Indicate what documents you would like to see, and the people you would like to interview. Upon arrival, indicate that your role in the validation process is one of assistance, and not one which is judgmental.

Complete the Evaluation Information page by providing estimates of content validity, reliability, and degree of improvement, respectively, for each instrument indicated by the applicant. Also, provide recommendations related to the claims to be validated, the target groups treated, the program description, documents to be modified, and data to be organized if warranted. Send copies of this report to the Coordinator of Validation and the applicant. The Coordinator may send copies of this report to members of the Validation Panel if the applicant chooses to pursue validation at any time in the future.

_____ _____

(Signature of Technical Assistant) (Date of Report)

Evaluation Information[1]

1 Names of Data Collection Instruments	2 Group Involved	3 Level of Validity	4 Level of Reliability	5 Comparison Performed
Achievement Tests				
Attitude Scales				
Product Ratings				
Observational Checklists				
Questionnaires				
Behavioral Records				
Other Forms Of Evidence				

[1]In column 1, write the name of each instrument used for data collection.
In column 2, write the name of the group (students, parents, teachers, etc.) from which data were collected.
In column 3, write V if the instrument has adequate validity, and N if it does not have adequate validity for the purpose used.
In column 4, write R if the instrument has adequate reliability, and N if it does not have adequate reliability for the purpose used.
In column 5, write S, M, or L for small, medium, and large estimated improvement:

S = a small amount (e. g. not close to the . 05 level of statistical significance);
M = a moderate amount (e. g. close to the . 05 level of statistical significance);
L = a large amount (e. g. at or exceeding the . 05 level of statistical significance).

Narrative Statement and Recommendations

Use additional pages if necessary.

1. State the claims which you would recommend the applicant pursue for validation.

2. Identify the target groups for which you believe the data demonstrate improvement. Indicate grade levels, subject content or any other relevant characteristic which the Validation Panel or a replicator would find useful to know.

3. Indicate any documents which should be developed or revised prior to continuing with the validation process. Note: it is not important to have staff development documents completed before validation, but it may be helpful to indicate what preparation you believe should be done to get ready for demonstration activities, including staff training. Indicate how the developmental costs and the costs for replication should be developed or modified.

4. Indicate any recommendations concerning data collection, analysis, and presentation which you believe are necessary to pursue validation.

APPENDIX D

Forms for Validation Panel Members

(See Handbook pages 14-15 for directions.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Notes By Validation Panel Members

Panel member _____ File # RV – _____

Applicant agency _____

Date of review _____ Date of Panel Presentation _____

Each panelist should feel free to take notes on any materials received in advance of the presentation, and on any aspect of the presentation before the Panel. The notes may be useful in structuring questions and in recalling what was written in the application, the curricular documents or in the evaluation tables and narrative, or what was said during the presentation and question and answer period. These notes are not going to be a part of the permanent record file, but each panel member should retain them for a few months in case there is an appeal of a decision against validating the program.

I. Notes from documents submitted in advance of the presentation.

II. Notes taken during the presentation.

This section is organized by topic. The applicant is not required to address all topics, but most of the topics should be discussed by the applicant in a presentation lasting approximately 60-90 minutes. An additional time period of 15-30 minutes will be devoted to questions by the Panel in which clarification or amplification is sought with respect to any part of the presentation, handouts, documents sent in advance, or which panel members think are important.

A. Documents

1. Student Texts
2. Student Worksheets
3. Student Assignments
4. Student Evaluation
5. Staff Training

B. Presentation

1. Goals or Objectives
2. Target Group
3. Community or Service Area Description
4. School or Agency Description
5. Initial Need for Program
6. History of Development
7. Theoretical Framework

8. Breadth of Program

9. Integration of Program

10. Major Activities

11. Sample Selection

12. Measurement Procedures

13. Validity

14. Reliability

15. Evaluation Design

16. Evaluation Results

17. Statistical Analyses

18. Educational Significance

19. Uniqueness of Program

20. Cost of Replication

III. In the space provided below, indicate your personal recommendation concerning the claims for effectiveness of the program. The program may be validated for one of the following (circle the appropriate letter for your choice):

a. All components with all portions of each target group.
b. All components with some portion of at least one target group.
c. Some components with all portions of each target group.
d. Some components with some portions of at least one target group.

Each panel member should be convinced that evidence of effectiveness demonstrates that the program works for each component of the program being recommended for validation. One of your tasks is to suggest how the program being validated should be written for dissemination. Keep in mind that the program may be adopted for any component (claim) in isolation from all other components. Therefore, if you select either b, c, or d above, indicate below which components and which portions of the target group are being recommended for validation. You will need to refer to these comments during the discussion period following the presentation.

APPENDIX E

Form for Summarizing Decision of the Validation Panel

(See Handbook page 15 for directions.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Validation Panel Report

Revised September 1988

File # RV– _____

Name of Chairperson: _____

Names of Panelists: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Applicant Agency: _____

Title of Program: _____

_____

Date of Presentation: _____

Vote of Panel: _____

Recommendation:

In the space provided below, summarize the recommendation of the Validation Panel concerning the claims for effectiveness of the program. The program may be validated for one of the following (circle the appropriate letter):

a. All components with all portions of each target group.
b. All components with some portion of at least one target group.
c. Some components with all portions of each target group.
d. Some components with some portions of at least one target group.

If the panel chooses either b, c, or d, indicate the limitations on the next page.

If the panel recommends delaying validation until specified changes are made in the application, the changes should be indicated on an attachment to this cover page. The panel should also indicate which of the following should review the revised application.

a. The coordinator of Validation,
b The Validation Panel which reviewed the current application, or
c. A new validation panel.

If the panel chooses c, a new presentation by the applicants will be required.

I. Indicate which components and which target groups are being recommended for validation (for choices b, c, or d).

II. Indicate the important features of the program which should be included in a half page description of the program.

APPENDIX F

Outline of the New York State Education Department Validation Process

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Outline Of the Revised New York State Education Department Validation Process

I. Preapplication assistance consisting of program review and evaluation planning through visits to applicant may be provided upon request.

II. Application Development

A. Preparation of a short narrative description of the program:
   1. Objectives or claims;
   2. Description of target groups;
   3. Description of program components;
   4. Necessary resources, training and cost information.

B. Completion of a Data Collection Report (if data have not been analyzed), or narrative evaluation results (if data have been analyzed).

C. Completion of a cover page including:
   1. Signature of Chief agency administrator.
   2. Assurances:
      a. Records will be available for a technical assistance visit.
      b. Allowing visits to the program, if validated.
      c. Provision of up to 10 days of staff development for each of three years, if all costs are reimbursed.
      d. Provision of locally developed materials to replicators, if costs of reproduction are reimbursed.

D. Attachment of copies of locally developed curricular and evaluation documents.

E. Submission of either 4 copies of a preliminary draft, or 10 copies of a final draft of the application and 3 copies of the attachments.

III. State Education Department Review of Application.

A. Content Bureau and Office of Federal Demonstration Programs:
   1. Objectives or claims of the program;
   2. Target group(s) of learners;
   3. Conceptual framework of the program and curricular documents;
   4. Instructional strategies;
   5. Consistency among program components;
   6. Relation to statewide needs and Content Bureau priorities;
   7. Relation to State syllabi (if applicable);
   8. Compliance with Commissioner's Regulations;
   9. Adequacy of evaluation instruments, scoring procedures, and evaluation design;
   10. Perceived (or actual) gains and strategies for making comparisons;
   11. Management aspects of the program for adoption;
   12. Resources required for program adoption;
   13. Availability of other programs with the same objectives and target groups.

B. Reviews are sent to applicant, technical assistant, and validation panel members.

IV. On-site Technical Assistance Visit.

A. Program review.
1. Identifies deficiencies in program objectives or claims.
2. Verifies existence of data indicated in application, and suggests additional data collection, if necessary.
3. Examines validity and reliability of the instruments and data collection procedures used.
4. Examines comparisons and/or suggests comparisons to be made.
5. Suggests best way to organize evidence for presentation to the validation panel.
6. Assists in the identification of resources needed for replication.
7. Identifies people who might be available to assist with local evaluation (if necessary).

B. Technical Assistance Report.
1. Describes adequacy of validity, reliability, and expected (or actual) size of improvement.
2. Recommends additional data collection and analyses if necessary, and indicates how to best display the information.
3. Assesses readiness to pursue validation, and provides recommendations which would maximize the likelihood of success in securing validation.

C. Copies of the report are submitted to SED, and to the applicant.

V. Applicant's follow-up to recommendations by the Technical Assistant.

A. May conduct new data collection or analyses, and prepare summary tables or graphs of the findings.

B. Prepares narrative explanation interpreting results.

C. Submits 10 copies to the Coordinator of Validation for distribution to validation panel.

VI. The Validation Panel

A. Composition

	For School Districts	For Other Agencies
1.	A School Administrator	An Agency Administrator
2.	A Curriculum Specialist	A Curricular or Program Specialist
3.	A Content Specialist	A Practitioner in a Relevant Field
4.	An Evaluation Specialist	An Evaluation Specialist
5.	A School Board Member	An Advisory Board (Council) Member
6.	A PTA Parent	A Community Member
7.	A Teacher Union Member	A Union Member

B. The Presentation

1. Total time to be 60-90 minutes plus a 15-30 minute question and answer period.
2. The suggested maximum number of presenters is four.

C. Validation Panel deliberations

1. Panel recommendations:
   a. Validation of the whole program for all target groups;
   b. Validation of a portion of the program for some of the target groups;
   c. Delay a decision until some specified condition has been met.
2. Panel identifies key components of program for replicators.